

No. USA5 No. 20-40135

**Supreme Court of the United  
States**

---

JOE BLESSETT, PETITIONER

*v.*

TEXAS OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY  
GENERAL GALVESTON COUNTY CHILD  
SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT DIVISION,  
*CITY OF GALVESTON, RESPONDENT*

---

*ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF  
APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT*

---

**APPENDIX**

JOE BLESSETT / Pro Se  
7970 Fredericksburg Rd. STE. 101-708  
San Antonio, Texas, 78229  
Tel.: 281-667-1174  
E-mail: joe@joebelessett.com

## 1. APPENDIX

### APPENDIX A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
GALVESTON DIVISION

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:17-CV-164

**FEBRUARY 12, 2018**

JOE BLESSETT,

PLAINTIFF,

VS.

TEXAS OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GALVESTON COUNTY CHILD SUPPORT  
ENFORCEMENT DIVISION,

DEFENDANT.

#### **Memorandum Opinion and Order**

Before the Court is the Motion to Dismiss filed by Defendant Office of Attorney General of Texas, Child Support Division (“Defendant”). Dkt. 21. After considering the law, the evidence, and the record of this case as a whole, the Court GRANTS Defendant’s motion to dismiss.

#### **Background**

On July 23, 1999, a Galveston County court entered a Final Decree of Divorce, which granted divorce between Plaintiff Joseph Blessett

## 2. APPENDIX

(“Blessett”) and Beverly Garcia (“Garcia”)<sup>1,2</sup> The decree also established Blessett’s paternity over a child born during the marriage and ordered him to pay Garcia child support payments of \$800 each month. On July 13, 2015, the state court entered an Order Confirming Support Arrearage with a judgment for child support arrears in the amount of \$131,923.14. Blessett subsequently filed a “Notice of Disestablishment of Paternity [and] Demand for Dismissal Pursuant to Sec. 466 42. U.S.C. § 666 5(D)(iii) Fraud and Duress” before the same state court on April 26, 2017<sup>3</sup>. The court denied Blessett’s request<sup>4</sup>. On May 19, 2017, Blessett filed this present action against Defendant. Blessett’s complaint is identical to the request he previously filed in state court. The state court entered an order granting final summary judgment in the case on June 30, 2017. In the pending motion, Defendant asserts Blessett’s complaint should be dismissed

---

<sup>1</sup> Dkt. 21-1. All matters in the state court case have been filed under Cause No. 98-FD-0817.

<sup>2</sup> Dkt. 21-2.

<sup>3</sup> Dkt. 21-3.

<sup>4</sup> Dkt. 21-4.

### 3. APPENDIX

under Rule 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Specifically, Defendant argues the Court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction under the Rooker-Feldman doctrine. In response, Blessett does not address Defendant's arguments regarding subject-matter jurisdiction. For the reasons stated below, the Court finds that Defendant's motion to dismiss should be granted.

#### **Analysis**

Under the Rooker-Feldman doctrine, federal district courts "do not have power to modify or reverse state court judgments' except when authorized by Congress." *Truong v. Bank of Am., N.A.*, 111 F.3d 377, 382 (5th Cir. 2013) (quoting *Union Planters Bank Nat'l Ass'n v. Salih*, 369 F.3d 457, 462 (5th Cir. 2004)). The doctrine consists of four elements: "(1) a state-court loser; (2) alleging harm caused by a state-court judgment; (3) that was rendered before the district court proceedings began; and (4) the federal suit requests review and reversal of the state-court judgment." *Burciaga v. Deutsche*

#### 4. APPENDIX

Bank Nat'l Tr. Co., 871 F.3d 380, 384 (5th Cir. 2017) (citing Exxon-Mobil Corp v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp., 544 U.S. 280, 284, 125 S.Ct. 1517, 161 L.Ed.2d 454 (2005)). The Court finds that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction in this case as all four elements of Rooker-Feldman are clearly met. In the July 23, 1999 Final Decree of Divorce, the state court declared Blessett the father of the child bom during his marriage to Garcia and ordered him to pay child support of \$800 each month. On July 13, 2015, the state court confirmed support arrearage and entered a judgment in the amount of \$131,923.14 against Blessett. On May 19, 2017, Blessett filed this present action seeking the disestablishment of paternity and termination of child support payments. The relevant dates show the state-court judgments were rendered before proceedings began in this Court. Blessett's complaint requests that the Court nullify the state court divorce decree and child support

## 5. APPENDIX

judgment by directly attacking the validity of the state court judgments.

Rooker-Feldman applies after court proceedings have “ended.” *Exxon-Mobil*, 544 U.S. at 291. Blessett failed to timely appeal any of the state court’s orders and judgments.

Whether state court proceedings “ended” on July 23, 1999, when the court issued the Final Decree of Divorce, or on July 13, 2015, when the court entered the Order Confirming Support Arrearage, or on June 30, 2017, when it granted final summary judgment against the Plaintiff, Blessett’s state court case has “ended” as he does not have any opportunity for state appeals. Thus, Rooker-Feldman properly serves as a basis requiring the dismissal of this case. *Powers v. Tex. Prop. & Cas. Ins. Guar. Assoc.*, 2010 WL 276164, at \*1 n.3 (S.D. Tex. Jan. 19, 2010) (Rosenthal, J.).

## 6. APPENDIX

The Court notes that Rooker-Feldman does not prohibit a plaintiff from presenting] some independent claim, albeit one that denies a legal conclusion that a state court has reached in a case to which [the plaintiff] was a party.” Truong, 717 F.3d at 382 (quoting Exxon Mobil, 544 U.S. at 293). However, the doctrine applies in this case because Blessett “seeks relief that directly attacks the validity of an existing state court judgment.” Weaver v. Tex. Capital Bank, N.A., 660 F.3d 900, 904 (5th Cir. 2011). His complaint does not present an independent claim that falls outside the scope of the doctrine. Blessett cannot circumvent Rooker-Feldman by “casting ... a complaint in the form of a civil rights action.” Houston v. Venneta Queen, 606 Fed.Appx. 725, 730 (5th Cir. 2015) (quoting Liedtke v. State Bar of Tex., 18 F.3d 315, 317 (5th Cir. 1994)).

## 7. APPENDIX

### Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Court GRANTS Defendant's motion to dismiss and this case is DISMISSED. As the Court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, it need not address Defendant's arguments in its motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Signed at Galveston, Texas,

this February 12, 2018

/s/ George C Hanks, Jr.

George C. Hanks, Jr.

United States District Judge



## 8. APPENDIX

APPENDIX B  
IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT  
No. 18-40142  
Summary Calendar  
MARCH 6, 2019

JOE BLESSETT,  
Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

TEXAS OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GALVESTON COUNTY CHILD SUPPORT  
ENFORCEMENT DIVISION,  
Defendant-Appellee

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
USDC No. 3:17-CV-164

Before DENNIS, CLEMENT, and OWEN,  
Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Joe Blessett, proceeding pro se, appeals the district court's dismissal of his civil complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to the *Rooker-Feldman*<sup>5 6</sup> doctrine. He argues that the

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

<sup>6</sup> *Rooker u. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413 (1923); *District of Columbia Court of Appeals u. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462 (1983).

## 9. APPENDIX

*Rooker-Feldman* doctrine is inapplicable because he did not receive notice of any of the judicial acts entered against him in state court and because he is seeking to set aside state court judgments obtained by extrinsic fraud. Blessett also complains that the district court erroneously denied his motions for entry of a default judgment and his motion for leave to file an amended complaint.

We review the grant of a Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction de novo. *Lane v. Halliburton*, 529 F.3d 548, 557 (5th Cir. 2008). In reviewing the dismissal order, we view “the well-pled factual allegations of the complaint as true” and construe them “in the light most favorable to the plaintiff.” *Id.*

The *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine dictates that federal district courts lack subject matter jurisdiction over lawsuits that effectively seek to “overturn” a state court ruling. *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp.*, 544 U.S. 280, 291 (2005). The doctrine applies to “cases brought by state-court losers complaining of injuries caused by state-court judgments rendered before the district court proceedings commenced and inviting district court review and rejection of those judgments.” *Id.* at 284.

Our review of the complaint reveals that Blessett asserted claims that collaterally attack the state court divorce decree and judgments concerning paternity and child support, as well as claims that assert constitutional violations relating to the enforcement of the state child support judgments. The former claims are barred under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine because they “invit[e] district court review and rejection” of the state divorce

## 10. APPENDIX

decree and child support judgments. See *Exxon Mobil*, 544 U.S. at 284. Moreover, it is of no help to Blessett that he claims he failed to receive notice of any hearing in relation to the child support arrearage judgment of July 13, 2015, as “[constitutional questions arising in state proceedings are to be resolved by the state courts.” *Liedtke v. State Bar of Tex.*, 18 F.3d 315, 317 (5th Cir. 1994).

We reach a different result as to Blessett’s claims that the defendant and its “contractors” engaged in fraud and violated his constitutional rights in their efforts to enforce and collect the state child support judgments. Because such claims do not ask the district court to review and reject a final order of a state court, they are not barred under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. See *Truong v. Bank of Am., N.A.*, 717 F.3d 377, 382-84 (5th Cir. 2013). Accordingly, we vacate the dismissal of such claims and remand to the district court.

As noted, Blessett also challenges the district court’s denial of his motions for entry of default judgment against the defendants based on their failure to answer his amended complaint. This challenge ignores that the district court denied leave to file the amended complaint, and thus the defendants were under no obligation to respond to an unfiled pleading. See Fed. R. CIV. P. 12(a)(1)(A). Accordingly, the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Blessett’s motions for entry of a default judgment against the defendants. See *Lewis v. Lynn*, 236 F.3d 766, 767 (5th Cir. 2001).

In view of the above determinations, it is unnecessary to consider Blessett’s arguments

## 11. APPENDIX

concerning the district court's denial of his motion seeking leave to file an amended complaint.

AFFIRMED IN PART, VACATED IN PART,  
AND REMANDED.

## 12. APPENDIX

### APPENDIX C UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS GALVESTON DIVISION

AUGUST 27, 2019

JOE BLESSETT,  
Plaintiff,

VS. CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:17-CV-00164  
TEXAS OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY  
GENERAL GALVESTON COUNTY CHILD  
SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT DIVISION,  
Defendant.

#### MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court is the Office of the Attorney General Texas Child Support Division's (the "OAG") Motion to Dismiss. Dkt. 79. After reviewing the motion, the response, the reply, and the applicable law, the Court **GRANTS** the motion.

#### **Factual Background and Prior Proceedings**

On July 23, 1999, a Galveston County court entered a Final Decree of Divorce between the Plaintiff, Joe Blessett ("Blessett"), and Beverly Garcia ("Garcia"). Dkt. 21-1. The court also established Blessett's paternity over a child born during the marriage and ordered him to pay child support payments of \$800 each month. *Id.* After Blessett consistently defaulted on this child support obligation for sixteen years, the county court entered an order in favor of Garcia confirming child support arrearage in the amount

### 13. APPENDIX

of \$131,923.14. Dkt. 21-2.

Almost two years later, Blessett attempted to challenge the child support order by filing a “Notice of Disestablishment of Paternity [and] Demand for Dismissal Pursuant to

Sec. 466 42. U.S.C. § 666 5(D)(iii) Fraud and Duress” with the same county court. Dkt. 21-3. After review, the county court denied Blessett’s “[d]emand for [d]ismissal” of the child support order. Dkt. 21-4. In response, Blessett filed the exact same “[d]emand for [d]ismissal” as his complaint in this case against the OAG and the “lead attorney” for the OAG in her official capacity, Diana M. Morton (“Morton”).<sup>7 8</sup> See Dkt. 1 (for the complaint in this case); *c.f.* Dkt. 21-3 (for the “[d]emand for [d]ismissal” filed in state court). On February 12, 2018, this Court dismissed Blessett’s complaint under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine, because the Court lacked subject matter

---

<sup>7</sup> See Dkt. 4 (Diana M. Morton was individually served with process in this suit as the “lead attorney” for the OAG); see also *Garden State Elec. Inspection Servs., Inc. v. Levin*, 144 F. App’x 247, 251 (3d Cir. 2005) (To determine whether a Plaintiff intended to sue a party in their official, as opposed to individual, capacity the Courts must look to the “course of proceedings.” Evidence that (1) the complaint listed the state as well as the individual employee as a defendant, and (2) that the employee never asserted the defense of qualified immunity favors a finding that the employee was sued in their official capacity. Both of these factors were satisfied in this case, therefore the Court finds that Morton was sued in her official capacity.).

<sup>8</sup> Dkt. 73 at 2-3 (Specifically, the Fifth Circuit held that Blessett had plead claims that “[the OAG] and its ‘contractors’ engaged in fraud and violated [Blessett’s] constitutional rights in their efforts to enforce and collect the state child support judgments,” which were not foreclosed by the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine.).

## 14. APPENDIX

jurisdiction to collaterally review a state court Judgment. Dkt. 60.

On appeal, the Fifth Circuit affirmed the Court's judgment in part and vacated it in part. Although the Fifth Circuit agreed that the Court had properly dismissed Blessett's attempts to collaterally attack the state court divorce decree and child support order, it found that Blessett's pleadings asserted additional, independent, claims in the attempted enforcement and collection of the child support order. These claims, the Fifth Circuit held, were within the Court's subject matter jurisdiction. Dkt. 73. Accordingly, the case was remanded to this Court to adjudicate Blessett's claims concerning fraud in the attempted enforcement and collection of the state child support judgments. *Id.* All other claims, including those concerning the deprivation of due process in state court, were dismissed from this case. *Id.* at 2 ("Moreover, it is of no help to Blessett that he claims he failed to receive notice of any hearing in relation to the child support arrearage judgment of July 13, 2015, as constitutional questions arising in state proceedings are to be resolved by the state courts.").

In light of the Fifth Circuit's order, the Court allowed Blessett an opportunity to amend his complaint. Dkt. 75. The OAG now moves to dismiss Blessett's amended complaint under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6). Dkt. 79. For the reasons stated below, the Court finds that Blessett's federal law claims must be dismissed on 12(b)(1) grounds. *See Hitt v. Pasadena*, 561 F.2d 606, 608 (5th Cir. 1977) ("Ordinarily, where both these grounds for dismissal apply, the court should

## 15. APPENDIX

dismiss only on the jurisdictional ground under Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(1), without reaching the question of failure to state a claim under Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(6).”). The Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction as to Blessett’s remaining state law claims. Accordingly, this case is dismissed in its entirety.

### Standard of Review

“[F]ederal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction.” *Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan v. Layale Enters. (In re B-727 Aircraft)*, 272 F.3d 264, 269 (5th Cir. 2001). Thus, a federal district court is required to presume that it does not have the jurisdiction to rule on a matter until “the party asserting jurisdiction” can prove otherwise. *Griffith v. Alcon Research, Ltd.*, 712 F. App’x 406, 408 (5th Cir. 2017) (internal quotation marks omitted). To make its case, the party asserting jurisdiction may direct the Court to look at “(1) the complaint alone; (2) the complaint supplemented by undisputed facts evidenced in the record; or (3) the complaint supplemented by undisputed facts plus the court’s resolution of disputed facts.” *Ramming v. United States*, 281 F.3d 158, 161 (5th Cir. 2001). Ultimately, a court cannot dismiss a claim for lack of subject matter jurisdiction unless “it appears certain that [a party] cannot prove any set of facts” in support of its assertion that jurisdiction is appropriate in federal court. *Bombardier Aero. Empl. Welfare Benefits Plan v. Ferrer, Poirot & Wansbrough, P.C.*, 354 F.3d 348, 351 (5th Cir. 2003).

### Analysis

Construing Blessett’s amended complaint liberally, Blessett asserts causes of action against



## 16. APPENDIX

the OAG and Morton for fraud,<sup>3</sup> intentional misrepresentation,<sup>4</sup> and the deprivation of constitutional rights under color of state law pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.<sup>5</sup> See *Kocurek v. Cuna Mut. Ins. Soc’y*, 459 F. App’x 371, 373 (5th Cir. 2012) (District courts are to construe a Plaintiff’s complaint liberally). However, the Eleventh Amendment’s grant of sovereign immunity bars Blessett from asserting his § 1983 claim against either the OAG or Morton. Obligated to dismiss Blessett’s only federal claim against non-diverse defendants, the Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Blessett’s remaining state law claims. *De Sanchez v. Banco Cent. de Nicaragua*, 770 F.2d 1385, 1389 (5th Cir. 1985) (“If sovereign immunity exists, then the court<sup>9 10 11</sup> lacks...subject matter jurisdiction to hear the case and must enter an order of dismissal.”); see also 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c) (A district court may decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction if “the district court has dismissed all claims over which it has original jurisdiction.”).

### A. Eleventh Amendment Grant of

---

<sup>9</sup> See Dkt. 75 at 6 (Count one: “Fraud by the omission of federal statutes and Texas family codes”); see also *id.* at 13 (The OAG and its contractors committed “fraud against the Plaintiff every time they applied enforcement and collection for child support order under Title IV-D.”)

<sup>10</sup> See *id.* at 31 (The OAG and its contractors “20-year period of repeated efforts to force Mr. Blessett in the Title IV- D program by *coercion, deception, and concealment* interferes with his legal rights to enjoy his Final Divorce Decree.”) (*Italics added*).

<sup>11</sup> See *id.* at 13 (The OAG and its contractors “deprived the Plaintiff’s protected civil rights in the application of penalties that are not expressly granted within the Final divorce decree granted on July 23, 1999.”).

## 17. APPENDIX

### Sovereign Immunity

The Supreme Court has held the Eleventh Amendment provides “an unconsenting State [with immunity] from suits brought in federal courts by her own citizens as well as by citizens of another state.” *Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 100 (1984); see U.S. Const. amend. XI. “There are only two exceptions to this longstanding rule.” *Pace v. Bogalusa City Sch. Bd.*, 325 F.3d 609, 613 (5th Cir. 2003), *aff’d*, 403 F.3d 272 (5th Cir. 2005). The first, is if Congress abrogates a state’s sovereign immunity to suit pursuant to its “power [under § 5] of the Fourteenth Amendment.” *Coll. Sav. Bank v. Fla. Prepaid Postsecondary Educ. Expense Bd.*, 527 U.S. 666, 670 (1999). And the second, is if a state decides to “waive its sovereign immunity by consenting to suit.” *Id.* Absent the presence of either of these two circumstances, a plaintiff cannot sue a state—or any of its agencies—in federal court. See *Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp.*, 465 U.S. at 100 (“[A] suit in which the State or one of its agencies or departments is named as the defendant is proscribed by the Eleventh Amendment.”); see also *Sw. Bell Tel. Co. v. City of El Paso*, 243 F.3d 936, 937-38 (5th Cir. 2001) (“[T]he Eleventh Amendment bar to suit in federal courts” applies to state agencies that act as an “arm of the state.”).

Comprehensive in nature, Eleventh Amendment protection also extends to individual state employees who are sued in their official capacity. See *Will v. Mich. Dep’t of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 70-71 (1989). This is because “a suit against a state official in his or her official capacity is not a suit against the official but rather is a suit

## 18. APPENDIX

against the official's office." *Id.* "As such, it is no different from a suit against the State itself."<sup>12</sup> *Id.* Accordingly, the same sovereign immunity protections apply to state employees acting in their official capacity as the state itself—"particularly when [not having] such a rule would allow [a plaintiff] to circumvent congressional intent by a mere pleading device." *Id.*

### **B. The OAG and Morton Enjoy Sovereign Immunity from this Suit**

In Texas, the OAG is the agency designated by the state to "to enforce child support orders and collect and distribute support payments." *Office of the AG v. Scholer*, 403 S.W.3d 859, 861-62 (Tex. 2013) ("Title IV, Part D, of the Social Security Act requires each state to designate an agency to enforce child support orders."). "And it is clear that [the] OAG's [various] child support division[s] are merely [] departments] within that agency." *Baker v. Child Support Div.*, No. 3:18-cv-341-C-BN, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 172600, at \*14 (N.D. Tex. Sept.

---

<sup>12</sup> In *Ex Parte Young*, the Supreme Court acknowledged a narrow exception to the general rule granting sovereign immunity to state employees who have been sued in their official capacity, however that exception does not apply here because Blessett does not argue that Texas' child support laws are unconstitutional nor does he request prospective relief. See *Okpalobi v. Foster*, 244 F.3d 405, 411 (5th Cir. 2001) ("The Eleventh Amendment bars suits by private citizens against a state in federal court, irrespective of the nature of the relief requested. A plaintiff may not avoid this bar simply by naming an individual state officer as a party in lieu of the State. Yet, few rules are without exceptions, and the exception to this rule allows suits against state officials for the purpose of enjoining the enforcement of an unconstitutional state statute.") (internal citations omitted).

## 19. APPENDIX

18, 2018); *see also Jeter v. Child Support Div.*, No. 3:18-CV-273-L-BH, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 201309, at \*8 n.4 (N.D. Tex. Nov. 5, 2018) (for the same holding). Therefore, the OAG, its various child support divisions, and its official employees, maintain Eleventh Amendment immunity from suit. *Id.* (holding the same); *see also Hall v. Tex. Comm'n on Law Enf't*, 685 F. App'x 337, 340 (5th Cir. 2017) (state agencies and their departments are "entitled to sovereign immunity to the same extent as the state itself.").

Here, none of the exceptions apply, which would allow Blessett to overcome this grant of sovereign immunity and sue the OAG or Morton in her official capacity for violating § 1983. "Texas has not consented to suit [under § 1983]." *Aguilar v. Tex. Dep't of Criminal Justice, Institutional Div.*, 160 F.3d 1052, 1054 (5th Cir. 1998). Nor has Congress abrogated Texas' "Eleventh Amendment immunity" under "section 1983." *Champagne v. Jefferson Parish Sheriff's Office*, 188 F.3d 312, 314 (5th Cir. 1999). Therefore, Blessett's § 1983 claims against the OAG and Morton are barred and must be dismissed.

### C. Remand

Having dismissed Blessett's § 1983 claim, the only claims that remain before the court are Blessett's Texas state law claims for fraud and intentional misrepresentation. Dkt. 75. In adherence to the "general rule," the Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over these remaining state-law claims since all federal-law claims have been eliminated. *Alphonse v. Arch Bay Holdings, L.L.C.*, 618 F. App'x 765, 769 (5th Cir. 2015) ("As a general rule, a court should decline to

## 20. APPENDIX

exercise jurisdiction over remaining state-law claims when all federal-law claims are eliminated before trial.”) (internal quotations omitted).

### **Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, the Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 79) is **GRANTED** and all claims asserted by Blessett in this matter are **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. All pending motions are hereby **DENIED AS MOOT**.

This is a **FINAL JUDGMENT**.

George C. Hanks Jr.  
United States District Judge

## 21. APPENDIX

### APPENDIX D

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
GALVESTON DIVISION

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:17-CV-164

JANUARY 27, 2020

JOE BLESSETT,

PLAINTIFF,

VS.

TEXAS OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GALVESTON COUNTY CHILD SUPPORT  
ENFORCEMENT DIVISION,

DEFENDANT.

### ORDER

Pending before the court is Plaintiffs Motion to Amend Judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e). Dkt. 96. A Rule 59(e) motion is “an extraordinary remedy that should be used sparingly.” *Deep Fix, LLC v. Marine Well Containment Co., LLC*, No. H-18-0948, 2019 WL 4221298, at \*2 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 5, 2019) (Rosenthal, C.J.). It is “not the proper vehicle for rehashing evidence, legal theories, or arguments that could have been offered or raised before the entry of judgment.” *Templet v. Hydrochem, Inc.*, 367 F.3d 473, 479 (5th Cir. 2004). Instead, it serves the narrow purpose of allowing a party to bring errors or newly discovered evidence to the Court’s

## 22. APPENDIX

attention. *See In re Rodriguez*, 695 F.3d 360, 371 (5th Cir. 2012).

In his motion, Plaintiff asks the court to reconsider its dismissal of his claims under a new legal theory. Because the motion does not meet the high bar that Rule 59(e) requires, I find no reason to revisit this court's previous decision. Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) is DENIED.

SIGNED at Galveston, Texas, the 27th day of January, 2020.

JEFFREY VINCENT BROWN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

23. APPENDIX

APPENDIX E

United States Court of  
Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

---

No. 20-40135  
SUMMARY CALENDER

---

JOE BLESSETT  
*Plaintiff—Appellant,*  
*versus*  
TEXAS OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GALVESTON COUNTY CHILD SUPPORT  
ENFORCEMENT DIVISION,  
*Defendant—Appellee.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
USDC No. 3:17-CV-164

---

Before CLEMENT, Ho, and OLDHAM, *Circuit*  
*Judges.*

JUDGMENT

Per Curiam:<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Pursuant to 5th Circuit Rule 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5th Circuit Rule 47.5.4.



## 24. APPENDIX

Joe Blessett, proceeding pro se, appeals the district court's dismissal of his civil complaint without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The district court dismissed Blessett's federal claims on the grounds that they were barred by Eleventh Amendment sovereign immunity and declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over his state-law claims.

As a preliminary matter, though Blessett listed 83 issues in his brief, to the extent that he did not present adequate argument addressing any of the 83 issues as they pertain to the reasons for the district court's dismissal of his federal claims and decision to decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over his state-law claims, the issues are abandoned. See *Hughes v. Johnson*, 191 F.3d 607, 613 (5th Cir. 1999); see also *Brinkmann v. Dallas Cty. Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987).

"The Eleventh Amendment bars an individual from suing a state in federal court unless the state consents to suit or Congress has clearly and validly abrogated the state's sovereign immunity." *Perez v. Region 20 Educ. Serv. Ctr.*, 307 F.3d 318, 326 (5th Cir. 2002). Even when the state is not a named defendant, Eleventh Amendment immunity extends to a state agency or political entity that effectively acts as an "alter ego" or an "arm" of the state. *Vogt v. Bd. of Comm'rs of Orleans Levee Dist.*, 294 F.3d 684, 688-89 (5th Cir. 2002). This court reviews de

## 25. APPENDIX

novo a conclusion that Eleventh Amendment immunity applies. See *Hale v. King*, 642 F.3d 492, 497 (5th Cir. 2011).

Citing *Ex Parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908), Blessett argues that the district court erred because he asserted claims for injunctive relief that were not barred. The *Ex Parte Young* exception to Eleventh Amendment immunity permits suits for prospective relief against state officials acting in violation of federal law. *Frew ex rel. Frew v. Hawkins*, 540 U.S. 431, 437 (2004). However, the exception does not apply in this case because Blessett's amended complaint did not specifically name individual state officials as defendants in their official capacities, allege an ongoing violation of federal law, and seek relief that properly can be characterized as prospective. See *Verizon Md. Inc. v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n of Md.*, 535 U.S. 635, 645 (2002).

Blessett also contends that the defendants waived sovereign immunity. However, his argument that Texas waived immunity through its participation in a federal program related to child support orders by receiving funds under Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 651 et seq., has no merit. See *Pennhurst State Sch. and Hosp. v. Halderman*, 451 U.S. 1, 17 (1981); *Edelman v. Jordan*, 415 U.S. 651, 673 (1974). Likewise, his argument that the defendants waived immunity by failing to timely raise it has no

## 27. APPENDIX

*Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Cohill*, 484 U.S. 343, 350 n.7 (1988), and fails to otherwise show an abuse of discretion, *see Batiste v. Island Records, Inc.*, 179 F.3d 217, 226-27 (5th Cir. 1999).

Finally, Blessett also appeals from the district court's denial of his postjudgment motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e). Because his motion raised arguments similar to those he raises on appeal with respect to *Ex Parte Young* and the defendants' purported waiver of immunity, he has not shown that the district court abused its discretion in denying his motion. *See Dearmore v. City of Garland*, 519 F.3d 517, 520 (5th Cir. 2008).

The judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED. Blessett's motion to compel, amended motion to compel, motion for injunctive relief, and motion to remand and for summary judgment are DENIED.